Allocating Federal Funds for Science and Technology (1995), but little has been done to implement the recommendations.

Service's article, nevertheless, does prompt one to raise the questions of what criteria are appropriate for certain science-related funding decisions and with whom does the funding decision-making responsibility reside. Setting science priorities, even within a given field, is not the same as establishing funding levels, that is, scientific input may be necessary, but not sufficient. It is inappropriate to ask a committee to provide recommendations if they do not have or are not given the full understanding of such a complex task. That is why certain decisions have to be left to the governmental or political process, in the best sense of the phrase. Scientists should be involved, but they have no more or less ability to predict the future and make wise funding decisions than do economists, lawyers, or politicians. If scientists are asked to make recommendations that are not appropriate, it will only lead to frustration and further cynicism regarding the entire funding allocation process.

Louis Ianniello
20006 Holly Pond Way,
Gaithersburg, MD 20879, USA

Particulate Matter Policy

Consistent with Jocelyn Kaiser's News & Comment article "Showdown over clean air science" (25 July, p. 466), airborne particulate matter (PM) has been repeatedly associated with morbidity and mortality, even at concentrations well within the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) 150-microgram per cubic meter ($\mu g/m^3$) upper acceptability limit on 24-hour average PM of 10 micrometers or less ($PM\text{-}_{10}$). Failure to identify plausible mechanisms by which $PM\text{-}_{10}$ (or $PM\text{-}_{2.5}$, or both) might cause such effects at these low concentrations suggests to some that stressors associated with PM, rather than PM itself, might be causal.

Attributing PM effects to 24-hour averages reported under the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) is like attributing daily mortality reported in a war zone to 24-hour airborne lead concentrations instead of bullets. Real-time PM monitoring has revealed significant variability during 24-hour periods of low PM (*1*). Brief PM excursions have reached twice the estimated concentration prevailing during the 1952 London fog. Effects that EPA attributes to 24-hour average PM seem equally consistent with causation by excursions to high PM concentrations, whose health significance is becoming increasingly evident. Excursions also could explain why a 24-hour PM effect threshold has been undiscernible, even though noncancerous effects typically exhibit thresholds. Effect thresholds can exist for PM too, but if they are threshold excursions embedded in 24-hour averages, their contribution to the 24-hour averages might be imperceptibly small, suggesting absence of a threshold.

This approach represents a more economical challenge for industry, whose compliance with the NAAQS could then focus on a small fraction of daily operations when PM control is least effective.

Robert A. Michaels
RAM TRAC Corporation,
3100 Rosendale Road,
Schenectady, NY 12309, USA

References

1. R. A. Michaels. *Aerosol Sci. Technol.* **25**, 437 (1996).

Corrections and Clarifications

In the letter "Genetics of Parkinson's disease" (14 Nov., p. 1213) and in the Table of Contents for the same issue (p. 1198), co-authors of Timothy Lynch—Matt Farrer, Mike Hut-

ton, and John Hardy—were inadvertently omitted during editing. They are all at the Mayo Clinic in Jacksonville, FL 32224, in the departments of pharmacology, biochemistry, and pharmacology, respectively. *Science* regrets the error.

In the Random Samples item "Gray matter on a chip" (7 Nov., p. 1021), the creation of the "neurochip" should have been credited to four researchers: Michael Maher, Jerome Pine, John Wright, and Yu-Chong Tai.

In the report by Nico Tjandra and Ad Bax (7 Nov., p. 1111), there were two errors in equation 1 (p. 1112). The correct equation appears below.

$$D_{PQ}(\theta,\phi) = -S\frac{\mu_0}{4\pi}\gamma_P\gamma_Q h \times \frac{A_a(3\cos^2\theta - 1) + \frac{3}{2}A_r\sin^2\theta\cos 2\phi}{4\pi^2 r_{PQ}^3}$$

Marcia Barinaga's 17 October Research News article, "Researchers find signals that guide young brain neurons (p. 385), did not mention the research team of Dan Goldowitz at the University of Tennessee College of Medicine as collaborators with Tom Curran's group on the identification of the mutant gene in *scrambler* and *yotari* mice.

Note 13 (p. 1834) of the technical comment "Highly variable mutation rates in commensal and pathogenic *Escherichia coli*" by I. Matic *et al.* (19 Sept., p. 1833) should have included the following sentence: "We thank an anonymous reviewer for suggesting, in the second paragraph of our comment, statistics and wording with regard to the absence of significant difference in the percentage of mismatch repair defective strains in pathogens as opposed to commensals."

Marcia Barinaga's 27 June Research News article "New imaging methods provide a better view into the brain" (p. 1974) erroneously stated that a 7-tesla human magnetic resonance imaging machine due to be installed at the University of Minnesota in December 1997 will be the first of its kind in the world. The Ohio State University College of Medicine in Columbus also has an 8-tesla human imaging machine that is scheduled to begin operation in December 1997.

Letters to the Editor

Letters may be submitted by e-mail (at science_letters@aaas.org), fax (202-789-4669), or regular mail (*Science*, 1200 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20005, USA). Letters are not routinely acknowledged. Full addresses, signatures, and daytime phone numbers should be included. Letters should be brief (300 words or less) and may be edited for reasons of clarity or space. They may appear in print and/or on the World Wide Web. Letter writers are not consulted before publication.

SCIENCE

Note to Readers about Technical Comments

Beginning in 1998, summaries of technical comments will appear in the printed journal; full text and figures will appear only online.

This change will allow:

- **Free access** to the full text of technical comments and responses for all *Science* Online readers.
- **Quicker publication** of reviewed comments, criticisms, and responses.
- **Linkage between reports and comments,** which would notify readers that subsequent comments were published about a report (or article) in *Science*.
- **More comprehensive figures and tables** in the comments and more detailed discussion of methods and instrumentation.
- **Up-front coverage** in summaries of the comments and responses, which will appear in "This Week in Science" in the printed journal, with Web addresses for the full texts.
- **Continued full citation,** with technical comment titles and authors continuing to be listed in the printed Table of Contents, and authors continuing to be cited in the quarterly online index.